DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 397 HE 014 234

AUTHOR	Horn, Frank T.
TITLE	Academic Disciplines and Debates: An Essay on Criminal Justice and Criminology as Professions in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards, Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (Dept. of Justice), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 80
GRANT	LEAA-79CD-AX-0001
NOTE	30p.; For related documents, see HE 014 228-235. Funded by the Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training.
AVAILABLE FROM	Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards, University of Illinois, Box 4348, Chicago, IL 60680.
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Education; Crime; *Criminology; Educational Development; *Educational History; Higher Education; *Human Services; Intellectual Disciplines; *Law Enforcement; Political Influences; *Professional Education; Social Work; *Sociology; Specialization
IDENTIFIERS	*Criminal Justice

ABSTRACT

Current developments concerning criminology and criminal justice education are viewed historically and placed within a broader perspective of academic professionalization, and a few of the debates going on within and between the two fields are considered. Some early sociologists made considerable claim to studies of crime, and criminology and sociology grew abreast in the formative days in the United States. Throughout the 1950s and early 1960s, academic or sociological criminology concerned itself with topics and research that seemed less relevant to the applied criminologist. Academic criminology became more sociological while applied criminology became more administrative. Criminal justice university programs increasingly grew by the middle 1960s because of federal monies from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The development of the fields of criminology and criminal justice in the 1970s have added some vagueness and confusion. Numerous criminal justice programs, for example, are practical and vocation oriented; on the other hand, many are very academic and multidisciplinary. Criminology, though certainly less vocational, has been sociological; yet other academics, such as psychologists, and political scientists and lawyers, have claimed to be criminologists. It is suggested that the fields of criminology and criminal justice need some self-evaluation and self-definition. A movement in the 1970s to make criminology a policy science and the link between criminal justice education and the community college movement are considered. The professionalization of social work is traced to enlighten some of the debates between criminology and criminal justice. (SW)

ED207397

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Joint Comm on Criminology & ~~Criminal Justice Educ~~ & Standards, Univ of Ill, Chicago TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Academic Disciplines and Debates:

An Essay on Criminal Justice and Criminology as Professions in Higher Education

Frank T. Morn

April 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Prepared for the
Joint Commission on Criminology and
Criminal Justice Education and Standards

Prepared under Grant Number 79CD-AX-0001
from the Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training,
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration,
U.S. Department of Justice

Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards.

NE014234

Publications of the
Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal
Justice Education and Standards

Accreditation and Its Significance for Programs of
Higher Education in Criminology and Criminal Justice:
A Review of the Literature

by Antony E. Simpson

Two Views of Criminology and Criminal Justice:
Definitions, Trends, and the Future

by John P. Conrad and Richard A. Myren

The Literature of Higher Education in
Criminology and Criminal Justice:
An Annotated Bibliography

by Carolyn Johnson

Professionalism Among Criminal Justice Educators

by Robert M. Regoli and Andrew W. Miracle, Jr.

Joint Commission on Criminology
and Criminal Justice Education and Standards
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Box 4348, Chicago, Illinois 60680

JOINT COMMISSION ON CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATION AND STANDARDS

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

HARRY E. ALLEN
San Jose State University
Washington Square
San Jose, California 95192.

LARRY R. BASSI
SUNY—Brockport
Brockport, New York 14420

GEORGE T. FELKENES
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

EDITH FLYNN
Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

C. RAY JEFFERY
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

WILLIAM J. MATHIAS
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

RICHTER H. MOORE JR.
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608

FRANK SCARPITTI
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19711

PROJECT DIRECTOR

RICHARD H. WARD
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Chicago, Illinois 60680

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

VINCENT J. WEBB
Universityof Illinois at Chicago Circle
Chicago, Illinois 60680

Contents

Preface 5

Academic Disciplines and Debates:
An Essay on Criminal Justice and
Criminology as Professions in Higher Education 7

The Rise of Criminology and Criminal Justice 7

The Culture of Professionalism 14

Debates and Discussions 16

Conclusions 26

Notes 27

Preface

One of the major activities of the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards has been to facilitate, support, and engage in debate about the fundamental nature of criminology and criminal justice education. At the heart of the debate are concerns about the differences between criminology and criminal justice. In an earlier monograph published by the Joint Commission, John Conrad and Richard Myren examined the differences between criminology and criminal justice by looking at definitions of the field(s) as well as contemporary trends and the future. In this monograph, Frank Morn goes beyond the substantive elements which have been presented as differentiating between criminology and criminal justice and seeks to determine why the debate exists. For Professor Morn, this determination lies in understanding the historical development of academic professions in general. Many of the issues and debates surrounding criminology and criminal justice are viewed as the product of a professionalization process characteristic of academic fields.

It is hoped that this monograph will add to a better understanding of the dynamics which shape the issues basic to the debates on criminology and criminal justice education. Such an understanding can lend perspective to these debates and keep them within a functional context.

Vincent J. Webb
Principal Investigator

Academic Disciplines and Debates: An Essay on Criminal Justice and Criminology as Professions in Higher Education

> American higher education is in a state of crises. It seems likely that the next decade will challenge the very survival of our university system. Rising costs, falling enrollments, and an uncertain job market, increasingly specialized disciplines and a host of other variables will inevitably change our educational institutions. It is critical that this change be monitored and directed. Where an educational system is concerned, "mere" survival is not an acceptable goal. If we abandon excellence, we abandon the future.[1]

It is, then, during these times and under these circumstances that a new academic profession is seeking self-identity, public acceptance, and professional respectability through academic legitimacy. Some may question John C. Sawhill, the president of New York University, from whom the above quote is taken, that the university borders on being a down-and-out enterprise. But no one can question that in these supposed trying times criminal justice and crime related studies have become up-and-coming activities. In 1965, for example, there were no more than 65 criminal justice programs in existence. In less than a decade, crime and crime fighting became a political issue and the number of programs grew to 700. By 1979, over 1200 criminal justice programs existed serving nearly 200,000 students in post-secondary educational situations.[2]

Criminology and criminal justice in higher education have existed for some time. But in the last decade such fields of study have increased in popularity so rapidly that new academic competitions and configurations have appeared. One thing is clear: another chapter in the history of academic professionalization is being written. Both criminology and criminal justice are trying to find their proper places in the groves of academe. I would like to give some historical perspective to the current developments of criminology and criminal justice, place these developments within a broader perspective of academic professionalization, and highlight a few of the debates going on within and between the two fields.

The Rise of Criminology and Criminal Justice

It has been widely accepted that criminology is a subdivision of sociology. Today, with the exception of some universities which have created schools of criminology, one studies sociology and then specializes in criminology. Presumably that means criminology grew out of and is dependent upon the mother field—

7

sociology. Of course, that is only partially true; criminology partakes largely of sociological theory and methodology, but also some sort of historical preemption has taken place. In America, at least, criminology as an intellectual and emotional inquiry developed independently of sociology.

The first real scholarly articulation of sociology in the United States was Lester Ward's *Dynamic Sociology* in 1883. Sociological questions were raised by a wide variety of persons in the nineteenth century. A "social science" movement began in the 1860's, and was soon compelled by two passions: social reform and love of science. Eventually many academic professions—such as history, economics, and political science—as well as institutions like the National Prison Association grew out of the social science movement. Some social gosplers like Walter Rauschenbusch, and settlement workers like Jane Addams became social critics. A host of thoughtful reformers such as Edward Bellamy, Robert Hunter, Walter Wyle and Herbert Croly raised social issues, and harkened back to the social science movement. But by the twentieth century the sorting out had occurred to such an extent that the social science movement as a movement died out. However: "The social betterment and reform organization which constituted the concrete-practical phase of social science a little later merged into the subscience called applied sociology and a variety of the other more or less practical social disciplines and technologies."[3]

But the scholarly investigation of the problems of rapid industrialization and urbanization grew also and was fed by the quest for social engineering during the Progressive era. One institutional development was the formation of the American Sociological Society in 1905. Quickly these new professionals wanted to be recognized as both a legitimate science—a social science—and have practical utility. One scholar believes that sociology at this early time was made up of many different fields and other upwardly mobile people who would have been unable to pursue academic careers in the more firmly established academic specialities.[4] In short, sociology in the formative years was made up of multidisciplinary casts of people with a strong survival instinct. As one scholar has indicated, sociology became the "science of leftovers".[5] It dealt with topics that others in their quest for specialization and professionalization had left behind.

European criminology was a product of the fears aroused by the revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Criminology developed less dramatically in nineteenth century America. Based upon the fads and fantasies prevailing in America, various explanations were given for crime. Phrenology, the main proponent being Charles Caldwell, studied the configurations of prisoners' heads and offered biological factors of crime. They based their explanations of human behavior upon the anatomy of the human body. Richard Dugdale's *The Jukes* (1877) stressed the importance of heredity and environment as criminogenic. Charles Loring Brace, an activist in the early juvenile justice and the social science movements, wrote *The Dangerous Classes of New York* in 1872. The causes of crime, according to Brace, could be categorized into "preventible" and "non-preventible" groups. Ignorance, intemperance, population density, idleness, broken homes and bad laws were preventible causes of crime. Impersonal urban relationships, orphanage and human passions were things that could not be prevented. Horace Redfield's *Homocide, North and South, Being a Comparative View of Crime Against the Person in Several Parts of the U.S.* (1888) blamed the advance of civilization as a cause of crime. Simply put, Redfield as well as Francis Lieber and Zebulon Brockway believed that advanced civilization brought increased temptations and aggravations that increased crime. But the

chief cause of crime according to all nineteenth-century criminologists was parental neglect, and its prevention was proper family training,[6] a subject analyzed by Simeon Nash in *Crime and the Family* (1876). The writings of Brace and Nash were part of the intellectual environment that gave rise to the National Prison Association and institutional experimentation at Elmira, New York that led to the "reformatory era" of penal history. Although there were no university programs in criminology, numerous criminal justice practitioners and thinkers belonging to the National Prison Association and the National Conference of Charities began producing thoughtful literature on crime and criminal justice in America.

Some early sociologists did lay considerable claim to studies of crime. Edward A. Ross, a professor of sociology at the University of Wisconsin, wrote *Sin and Society* in 1907. True to his "progressive" instincts, Ross did not write about the plain criminal. Instead he was concerned over the quasi-criminal, the respectable person who leeched off of society. The key to this "criminaloid" was not evil impulse but moral insensibility, Ross believed. Theodore Roosevelt was impressed and wrote to Ross that "you show that the worst evils we have to combat have inevitably evolved along with the evolution of society itself, and that the perspective of conduct must change from age to age."[7] The Northwestern Law School agreed, and in 1909, one hundred academics and criminal justice personnel gathered to form the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology. A glance at the first decade or so of *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, the organization's publication, indicated the ambiguity of the field. Criminology still remained the rubric for those academics who looked to European scholars and those practitioners who looked to American experiences as interpretive tools. At first, this hazy situation posed no problem because both groups were interested in descriptive narratives of problems, personalities, and promises of the crime control establishment in America and Europe. But within the next two decades an academic staking of claims and territory would occur by various criminologists.

August Vollmer became the most articulate police person of the first forty years of the century. A part owner of a store in Berkeley, California, Vollmer was persuaded to run for election as city marshall in 1905. When the city created its police department, Vollmer became the chief of police, a position he held for the next several decades. Besides creating an efficient police department, Vollmer began the "college cop" movement which culminated in the formation of the school of criminology at the University of California. He felt that the main requirements for becoming a policeman in the past had been "political pull and brute strength." The result was a police force characterized by "incivility, ignorance, brutality, and graft." A major step in uplifting the police was education; not training by other policemen but education by academics. Although criminology as a science was still in its infancy, he would maintain, it could be useful to the police officer who was functioning more and more as a social worker. For example, anti-social behavior, a precursor to criminal activity, shows up early in an individual. The police should identify these potential criminals, whom Vollmer labeled "predelinquents", and refer them to appropriate institutions. Such judgments needed to be based upon education. To Vollmer, the policeman was meant to be a social scientist, a "practical criminologist."[8]

Vollmer became the most outspoken practical criminologist throughout the 1920's and 1930's. One of his disciples, O.W. Wilson would carry on the tradition. Vollmer became a traveling consultant, a trouble-shooter for ailing departments. For example, he left Berkeley in 1923-24 to be head of the Los Angeles

police department. Between 1929 and 1931 a national commission, the Wickersham Commission, studied crime in America. Vollmer wrote one of the fourteen *Reports*, the one on *The Police*, and advocated better educated personnel in criminal justice agencies. Apparently the visibility and activity of Vollmer had shifted the Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology at Northwestern still further into practical criminology. In 1932, the Institute purchased the famous criminalist Calvin Goddard's *American Journal of Police Science* and incorporated it into the existing official publication.

When asked in 1933 by the *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science* to review the "Police Progress in the Past Twenty-Five Years", Vollmer would cite the growing crime fighting skills and technology of the police. He had always been fascinated by science and had helped establish one of the first crime labs in the United States. But he also took pride in the spread of the college cop movement. San Jose State College had established the first four year college level law enforcement program in 1931. The University of Southern California and Michigan State University soon followed, creating programs of a more practical criminological persuasion. At the same time some new developments were occurring in theoretical criminology.[9]

Throughout the 1920's and 1930's Americans became more sensitive to crime and criminals. Across the nation crime became a political issue. Chicago earned the reputation of "crime capital" of America. The Crime Commission Movement began in Chicago and soon spread to other cities, states, and eventually to the federal government. These crime commissions watchdogged the criminal justice systems, the implication being that they were as criminal as the criminal classes.[10] They also pointed out the need for further systematic study of the organization and processes of the criminal justice system. But, new crises tend to upstage old ones, and the crime problem of the 1920's seemed less important in the depression decade of the 1930's. It was at this time that criminology was captured by sociology in the universities.

Perhaps, the pioneer academic work in American criminology was written by a trained economist. Maurice F. Parmelee wrote *Criminology* in 1918 and discussed such topics as the nature of crime, criminogenic factors in environment, criminal types, and criminal justice agencies and procedure. One sign that a body of knowledge has become a discipline, a field of study, is the appearance of textbooks. In the next twenty years an explosion of textbooks filled with criminological theory occurred. John L. Gillin, for example, wrote *Criminology and Penology* in 1926. Thirteen chapters dealt with the causes of crime and twenty-three discussed control of crime. Philip A. Parson's *Crime and the Criminal* (1926) did much the same thing. But Edwin Sutherland's *Criminology*, first published in 1924, is credited with being the turning point toward modern criminological thought. Like the authors before him, Sutherland dealt with the nature and causes of crime. Seventeen chapters were devoted to such practical topics as police, prisons and parole. But he differed from the past due to his emphasis upon empirical research. He was the first American sociologist to offer a systematic sociological examination of criminological thought. He represents also, changing trends in sociology.[11]

In the formative years of sociology as an academic endeavor, important questions had to be addressed. What was the place of sociology in the academic world? What was the nature of the sociological enterprise? Was it to be a profession in the sense that law and medicine had become? Sociology thus far, had taken one of two paths. Theoretical sociology, decidedly a European contri-

bution, would have a natural place in the university setting. But European universities were unlike American universities. Both may be the marketplace of ideas but a long tradition of anti-intellectualism dictated that knowledge have practical utility in America. Theory for theory's sake had no place in the American popular mind.[12] Applied or clinical sociology had been popular in the first two decades of the century. The Social Settlement Movement and the early history of social work reflected this clinical approach to sociology. By 1928, there were 490 such clinics in the United States which placed emphasis upon the "case history" method research. William Healy's *The Individual Delinquent* (1914) served as a prototype. William Thomas' *The Unadjusted Girl* and Clifford Shaw's *Jack Roller* would carry the tradition into the 20's and 30's.[13]

But as social work professionalized, a topic to be discussed later, clinical sociology gave way to clinical psychology as a model and methodology. Consequently, during the 1920's clinical sociology fell on hard times. One of the most likely places for applied sociology to flourish was the Institute for Juvenile Research. But Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay of the Institute were not drawn to the idea of clinical sociology, and, instead, like their colleagues at the University of Chicago, they emphasized empirical research. A sociologist, then, would not leave the university and become a social servant; the sociologist was to be a social scientist. Professional schools of sociology, therefore, were out of the question; instead sociology was to be within the traditional university structure as a science rather than a profession.[14]

The developing nature of sociology was dictated also by the consumers of sociological knowledge. Between 1910 and 1919 most readers of articles in the *American Journal of Sociology* were reformers (33%), other sociologists (20%), salaried professionals (12%), and mixed assortment of other intellectuals. On the other hand, between 1920 and 1929 a shuffling had occurred with salaried professionals (30%) increasingly reading sociological information. Other sociologists (25%), reformers (13%), and assorted others (32%), were the clientele for the sociologist researcher. In short, bureaucrats and policy makers were increasingly reading the sociologist.[15] Apparently, World War I had created the role of the policy scientist and it was these people who provided a market for sociological research. Sociologists and social researchers found themselves on special commissions. For example, the Commission on Race Relations, established to study the Chicago race riots of 1919, produced a report, *The Negro in Chicago*, which became model for monographs throughout the 1920's and 1930's. Their work was to be practical in that it had policy implications. It was to be a high level, an intellectual level, of practicality.

The University of Chicago began its monopoly of sociology in the 1920's. Many of the classical sociological works were on crime and deviance issues, and were either done by faculty or by students of the University of Chicago. In short, criminology and sociology grew abreast in those formative days. Names like Edwin Sutherland (*The Professional Thief*), Clifford Shaw (*The Jack Roller*), Frederick Thrasher (*The Gang*) and Walter Reckless (*Vice in Chicago*) lent scientific authority to criminology as well. Apparently, the University of Chicago's sociology and criminology people were picky enough that when the great college cop, August Vollmer, came to the University to teach for one year, he settled into the political science department rather than the sociology department.

Tensions within professions are quite common. Occasionally rebellions will occur. One such rebellion happened in the early 1930's. As suggested earlier,

throughout the 1920's the University of Chicago department of sociology dominated the field. The American Sociological Society, and its journal, *The American Journal of Sociology*, were organs for the University of Chicago sociologists. The number of Ph.D.'s was increasing as sociology became an increasingly popular field of study. Also, quantification as a methodology became popular outside the Chicago school and many social scientists questioned the hegemony of the midwesterners. The University of Chicago seemed dated, dominating, and unresponsive to the field's changing character. This led, in 1935, to a rebellion of young Turks under the leadership of L.L. Bernard and the forming of the *American Sociological Review* as an alternative professional publication in sociology.[16]

In terms of criminology, the 1930's was a major growth period. Much of the sociological theory on crime developed at this time. Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay studied the "delinquency areas" of the city. Edwin Sutherland talked of "differential association" and coined the famous phrase "white collar" crime. And Thorsten Sellin wrote his famous *Culture, Conflict and Crime* in 1938. In short, criminology was becoming firmly sociological. Enough ambiguity remained, however, so that Sellin could write in his book that "we are compelled to admit that criminology, as traditionally conceived, is a bastard science grown out of public preoccupation with a social plague." That is to say, that by 1938 criminology still had a hybrid quality due to the variety of scholars with their different perspectives grappling with a new field. Criminology, as yet, was not a discipline in its own right, he would contend. Instead, it was a meeting place for particular members of various established disciplines who happened to share a strong interest in issues and topics relevant to crime.[17]

In an attempt to define their place in this changing field called criminology, August Vollmer and some of his students founded the National Association of College Police Training Officials in Berkeley, California in 1941.[18] This organization attracted the "practical criminologist", more particularly law enforcement teachers concerned with police courses growing in the four year and two year colleges of California. After the interruption of the war, the organization's name was changed in 1946 to the Society for the Advancement of Criminology. For the next ten years criminology for these applied criminologists was not limited to the study of the causes, treatment, and prevention of crime. Crime detection, law enforcement administration, traffic administration, probation, and juvenile delinquency control were also a part of criminology. In these early days, the organization was linked closely to Vollmer, the University of California, and the West Coast.[19]

In the late 1950's and early 1960's, there was rapid expansion of American universities. One of the more popular areas of study was sociology, greatly strengthening that department's place on American campuses. In 1957, the name of the Society was changed to the American Society of Criminology. The next year the Society prepared "A Proposal to Study the Teaching and Research of Criminology in the United States" because:

> The development of criminology programs in universities and colleges has been rapid. Each year finds new programs started and older ones expanded. Despite this progress a general lack of (consensus) exists among persons responsible for the development of these programs . . .

The proposal went on to advocate conferences made up of both academicians and practitioners to evaluate and give direction for future programs. But by 1959 the

Society was undergoing dramatic changes. The sociological criminologists became more active in the organization and soon began to dominate. The center of organizational activities shifted eastward. *Criminologica*, a newsletter journal, was begun in 1963 giving theoretical and methodological works preferential publication. Mainstream criminology began to dominate. Throughout the 1950's and early 1960's academic or sociological criminology concerned itself with topics and research that seemed less relevant to the applied criminologist. Academic criminology went more sociological while applied criminology went more administrative. Academic criminology became concerned with: a) topologies, b) hidden or unreported deviance, c) delinquent subcultures, and d) the empirical investigation of criminal justice agencies. This latter area had some direct interest and interface for the two criminologies, but the conclusions of these studies were unsettling. The overall assessment of criminal justice was pessimistic. The criminal justice system, it was determined, could only do a minimal job of containing criminality.[21] Applied criminologists felt less and less at home in the organization they founded. Sociologists became more prominent in the organization and questions that had not bothered the founders became more important: What was the place of criminology among academic disciplines; What was to be done with the "applied criminologist" crowd?

As early as 1963 some members of the American Society of Criminology split off to form the International Association of Police Professors.[22] If the name of the new organization is any clue, these were applied criminologists who felt the Society had become too sociological. It looked as though the American Society of Criminology was to be for the sociological criminologist, and the new organization was to be for the applied criminologist. The 1960's made crime and crime control a political issue again. The difference between the 1960's and the 1920's, of course, was New Deal Liberalism; and the growth of "applied criminology" was stimulated by government spending. By the mid 60's, university programs in criminal justice—like that at State University of New York at Albany and John Jay in New York City—increased. L.E.A.A. and L.E.E.P. poured millions into the academic economy.

In keeping with the changing character of the field of study, the name of the International Association of Police Professors was changed to the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences in 1970. The organization, concerned over the topsy-turvy development of the field, created the Accreditation and Standards Committee in 1974. Although the committee was made up of people from the American Society of Criminology, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the American Bar Association, and the American Correctional Association, the American Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences simply wanted to be the accreditation mechanism for post-secondary criminal justice education. Many questioned the accreditation movement. Instead, the establishing of minimum standards seemed more plausible. And it would be too one-sided, especially in light of the historic "Siamese Twin" quality of criminology and criminal justice, to discuss and develop standards without criminological input. To that end the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards was created as a research organization. A new academic profession was being created, but the historic interrelationships between criminology and criminal justice remained. Within the Joint Commission's Board of Directors, which serves as some sort of microcosm for a much larger debate, these two fields continue to divide over the issues: What is the place of criminology and criminal justice in the academic market place?

The Culture of Professionalism

Basic to the debates and discussions is a general lack of understanding of the nature and history of professions as an attribute of culture. So, first a word about professionalism in America. In one respect, professions and professionalization are a historic throwback to the guild system of medieval culture. On the other hand, professions as we know them today are really only one hundred years old. From the 1870's onward professionalization occurred so rapidly that there became, as one historian has labeled it, a "culture of professionalism". It became a means of upward mobility and a status symbol in and of itself. It became an expression of middle-class values in the work world. And in many ways it allowed the creation of a new elite structure in a democracy.[23]

Furthermore, higher education has played a crucial role in this professionalization cult. Higher education has served at least three functions in the rise of professions. First, universities establish authority, they build a mystique. The more elaborate the rituals and requirements, the more esoteric the theoretical knowledge, the greater will be the prestige and status. It is here that the layman and uninitiated are convinced of the complexity and sophistication of a field of knowledge. Second, it is in the university where an occupation, subculture, or body of knowledge achieve status. Vocations, if they are found worthy of becoming subjects of study and academic professionalization, become intellectualized. Nursing, physical education and social work in the nineteenth century, and Black studies, Latin American studies, and Urban studies in the twentieth century are areas of study that found respectability through adoption as academic areas.

Third, and this is especially true in America, the university is where "usable knowledge" was to be discovered and developed. Americans have had little patience for the more esoteric fields or for "closet scholars". Instead, Americans want academicians to be problem solvers. Academic work, no matter how theoretical or abstract, must have utility. This tendency, steadily increasing since the New Deal, has led to various "Brain Trusts" of professors in Washington. James Q. Wilson, a political scientist at Harvard who frequently serves as an advisor to government, has wondered why politicians hire academics. After all, Wilson declares,

> Our knowledge is not the kind that is useful in managing large institutions. Academicians are essentially in the business of trying to invent general explanations for complicated human affairs. We are simplifiers, trying to compress reality into something suitable for 35 lectures to undergraduates. We look for general explanations and tend to be insensitive to detail, nuance, personality—everything that's important in managing government.[24]

There are two other roles academic-intellectuals might play which Wilson fails to mention. They could provide men of power with ideological justifications for policy. Herbert Spencer and William Graham Sumner of the nineteenth century, for example, forged a social Darwinism which had profound impact upon public policy.[25] In the twentieth century, the "opportunity theory" of Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin found its way into the Kennedy-Johnson policy on juvenile delinquency. In addition, they could be critics of government, exposing and probing political weaknesses, such as many sociologists did in the 1920's.[26]

Of course, another side of this growing culture of professionalism was the recognition of the complexity of the human existence. In short, not only was it necessary to take certain skills from the masses but these skills, because of their

complexity, should break down into specialties. The medical field first experienced this fragmentation. For example, the American Neurological Association was formed in 1875. The next year both the American Dermatological Association and the American Gynecological Society were formed. In 1880 surgeons established the American Surgical Association. At first blush criminal justice seems to have taken a reverse course. It went from specialized police studies and corrections programs to a more total systems approach. That may not be a valid exception because total systems study is merely a specialized research strategy. But even if it is true it may be due to the fact that the early educational model for criminal justice was in-service training. Now that criminal justice is becoming academically respectable, specialization does occur, and it probably has to do with another component to professionalization: the impact of the higher education industry. The only difference between traditional professions and traditional crafts is the impact of the university or special schools.

Perhaps a couple of historical examples will illustrate some attributes of the professionalization process and provide insight for criminologist and criminal justician alike.

Before the Civil War, care of the dead was generally left to the family or was connected to the cabinet-making, furniture-making, and livery trades. Then a process began to evolve as: a) more and more people, especially in the middle-class, did not want to take care of their own dead; b) genuine public health concerns, especially in the cities, arose over the casual treatment of the dead; and c) more and more people within the cabinet, furniture, and livery trades began to specialize. In short, there was a public demand, a public concern, and a public response to the problem of the dead among the living. After the first stage of craft specialization came the next step of development: monopolization. In other words, those people who had been specialists (coffin makers) began to spread their influence to provide full services for the bereaved from moment of death to grave site. In addition, there was the process of vocabularizing. New words, titles, and designations were coined. Coffins became caskets. Funeral directors or embalming surgeons worked in funeral homes or parlors using the magical techniques of mortuary science. In the 1880's mortuary schools arose, and in 1884 the National Funeral Directors' Association was established to educate, regulate, and license the new profession. Their first Code of Ethics was written in 1884 and ended with the declaration that "there is, perhaps, no profession, after that of the sacred ministry, in which a high-toned morality is more imperatively necessary than that of a funeral director."[27]

One of the attributes of this professionalism movement is the monopolization of knowledge and skills of a field. In some ways it is reconstruction of the notions of amateurism.[28] In earlier times the term amateur referred to a respectable person who pursued an activity for the love of it. It was to have a common-sense knowledge of something which was arrived at in informal ways. In time, the amateur, who might have skills and knowledge, became a person who did not have proper certification. On one hand, professionalization became a process in which skills and techniques and knowledge were detached from the public. On the other hand, it was the monopolization of the proper certification of those who had skills. One could have skills but they had to be obtained in proper ways. Perhaps an example of this is the demise of folk medicine and the rise of professional medicine in America.

Pain relief rather than cure characterized much of medical science in nineteenth century America. Many Americans, harkening back to a folk medicine

tradition, simply preferred home remedies to the doctor's visit. Doctors and hospitals were to be the last resort. Ambitious entrepreneurs exploited popular suspicions of professional medicine and became "toadstool millionaires" by producing and dispensing various panaceas of questionable pharmacological value. This was not limited to the snake-oil medicine man who traveled the rural circuit. Large industries developed with extensive mail-order empires. Pe-ru-na, Hostetter's Stomach Bitters, Dr. Tucker's Asthma Specific, Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrups, and Lydia Pinkham's Vegetable Compound were just a few patent medicines that survived well into the twentieth century. Even CocaCola at the turn of the century was suspected of being laced with cocaine. Although the American Medical Association (1847) and the American Pharmaceutical Association (1852) were formed by mid-century, they were unable to control the widely popular patent medicine industry. In fact, by 1881 the manufacturers of these popular medicines had formed their own professional group, the Proprietary Association of America. It would not be until 1898 that the retail druggist would organize the National Association of Retail Druggists and join the A.M.A. and A.Ph.A. to stamp out the folk medicine movement.[29]

The crusade was successful because it linked up with the growing public awareness of the prevalence of narcotics in America and its connection with vice and crime. Southern fears of "cocaine and the colored man," and west coast dislike of "opium and the Oriental" led to the Harrison Anti-Narcotic Law of 1914. Such a national policy, however, was reached in a stepladder fashion and a series of earlier laws along the way decimated the patent medicine enterprise. The Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906, for example, required the listing of all narcotics on the labels of patent medicines shipped in interstate commerce. In the next ten years, state laws further restricted the toadstool millionaires, and patent medicines ceased to be a mainstay in folk medicine. Physicians and pharmacists had to pay the price of greater regulation, but they emerged in complete control of health services in America. Although not totally eliminated, much of the amateur was removed from medical science. It was only after these battles that the medical and pharmaceutical practitioners truly became professional.[30]

Debates and Discussions

Another part of the professionalization process is self-definition. What am I, and what am I not? It is at this time we should look at specifically crime-related studies. In this particular case, just what is the difference between criminology and criminal justice? It is hoped that the previous historical sketches have pointed out the entangled beginnings and developings of the two fields and placed them in the broader context of the "culture of professionalism" in America. One should be aware, however, that the development of the fields in the 1970's have added some vagueness and confusion. Numerous criminal justice programs, for example, are practical and vocation oriented. On the other hand, many are very academic and multidisciplinary. Criminology, though certainly less vocational, has been sociological; yet other academics, such as psychologists, and political scientists and lawyers, have laid claim to being criminologists. Mix these components all together and both criminology and criminal justice needed some self-evaluation and review as to what was criminology and criminal justice.

Throughout the 70's one of the most outspoken criminologists was C. Ray Jeffery. As early as 1969 Jeffery saw "the challenge to criminology". Social scientists had been criticized for their work in the war on poverty. Crime now

offered the social scientists new opportunities, and Jeffery predicted that a "new era of criminology" had arrived. Now "we must be willing, as at no other point in history, to reevaluate our theories, methods and training techniques," Jeffery declared.[31] Eight years later, after millions of federal dollars went into the academic economy for the study of criminal justice, Jeffery was president of the American Society of Criminology. After acknowledging that criminology did not enjoy a good reputation, Jeffery hoped that:

> The membership of the American Society of Criminology would regard the professionalization of criminology as the foremost task facing us in the years ahead. This will mean a joint effort of practitioner and academician as well as a joint effort of psychology, criminology, and biology. Neither the academician nor the practitioner can afford to ignore the other.[32]

The next year, apparently, after further reflecting upon the rise of criminal justice and its impact on criminology, Jeffery warned that "we in criminology are so dominated by the legal and political issues involved in law enforcement, court administration and prison administration that we have a difficult time defining criminology." Then, just as many criminal justice academicians were doing, Jeffery concluded that criminology must be an interdisciplinary behavioral science. Sociology would remain important, but, for Jeffery, it would be one of tripartite hierarchy which would include psychology and biology. Thus was born Jeffery's Biosocial Criminology.[33]

Much like Jeffery, Walter C. Reckless in 1970 felt that new directions in criminology were necessary. "Criminological study of the present and future must make allowances for the way the system operates and will have to discover behavioral dimensions that apply realistically to cases at hand."[34] E.E. Wood, in a paper delivered to the Eastern Sociological Society in 1971, explored "A Change in Perspective: From Criminology to Criminal Justice." Significant changes in deviance theory had occurred in the 50's and 60's. The impact and labeling of people by the criminal justice system was seen as contributing to criminality. Therefore criminologists would increasingly look to criminal justice institutions, and such studies would change what is being taught as criminology. Wood even noted that the term criminal justice was replacing criminology even within the American Sociological Association.[35]

Gilbert Geis and Robert F. Meier "looking backward and forward" in 1978 acknowledged that criminology had been almost exclusively placed in sociology in the 1950's and 1960's where it was accorded as a low status enterprise. But after crime became a political issue in the 1970's, criminology became a profitable and popular field of study. Geis and Meier conducted a survey of prominent criminologists to assess future developments of the discipline. The rise of ideology over methodology was seen to be a weakness, obviously a reaction to Marxist criminology. On the other hand, the return to deviance theory and theorizing, and the disassociation with applied criminology were seen as positive developments. One respondent said that:

> In a sense, we are returning to the practices of an even earlier era, when mainstream sociologists were concerned with crime, and criminology and deviance were less separate fields. While specialization has led to much excellent research and imaginative theorizing, it has also tended to isolate us from mainstream developments.[36]

To perpetuate this trend and keep the distinctions between criminology and criminal justice clear, the overwhelming advice to newcomers in criminology was an intensive training in theory and quantitative methods.[37]

Donald Cressey, when he received the Edwin H. Sutherland Award from the American Society of Criminology in 1967, made two predictions. One, which he acknowledged later as failing to come true, was that criminology and criminal justice would become more integrated around central topics; the one he favored at that time was the topic of negotiated justice. The second prediction was that the "revived interest in the criminal law and its administration (would) significantly change the content of what has been regarded as 'criminology' in the United States."[38] Eleven years later Cressey was perplexed over that second prediction because "rather than a *blending* of social science knowledge and legal knowledge, there seems to have been a smothering of social science knowledge as criminology has expanded."[39] As many criminology courses and curricula floated freely from sociology departments, Cressey warned that the impression would gain ground that "no academic discipline has a monopoly on criminology."[40] Indeed, though Cressey does not mention it, it seems that as criminology and criminologists moved into new academic environments, they were trying to stake their claim to new academic territory. Criminology, in short, did not want to move from being a weak sister in sociology to being one in criminal justice.

The rapid changes of the 1970's had some detrimental effects. In the heady atmosphere of the 1970's, criminology lost focus, and according to Cressey, "there is an appalling lack of consensus among criminologists regarding even such fundamental problems as definition of subject matter."[41] Second, the "new criminologists" (people like James Q. Wilson, E. van den Haag, I. Ehrlich, David Fogel, Norval Morris and Gordon Hawkins) were making criminology a policy science. Criminology should return to the ivory tower and be a science-oriented, research enterprise rather than a "crime fighting coalition." Cressey, as a spokesman for the ivory tower, could warn that "criminologists should not abandon science to become policy advisors in this repressive war on crime."[42]

The Joint Commission joined the debates also and published the two views of John Conrad and Richard Myren on definitions, trends, and the future of criminology and criminal justice. Criminology, to Conrad, is the application of the scientific method to "the explanation of the phenomena generated by the interactions of the processes in law-making, law-breaking, and the reactions of society to these processes." Criminologists, though heavily sociological of late, draw upon the theories and methodologies of all social and some biological sciences. Criminal justice, on the other hand, was the application of criminological research findings. "These professions," Conrad contends,"really are comparable to medicine or engineering; they stand in relation to criminology as medicine does to biology or engineering to the physical sciences."[43] Methodological and statistical tools transcend and bind the social sciences so that criminology can be a multidisciplinary field with a common language. The anticipated consequences of criminological training are research and teaching. Criminal justicians, Conrad believes, need criminology as part of their baggage. But in addition, criminal justice is set apart because of the need to know how the system operates, how the criminal law impacts on that system, and how that system should be administered. This may be done in the university, but like medicine it would best be done in a professional school.[44]

Richard Myren, of the School of Justice at the American University, sees distinctions between criminology and criminal justice also. The controversy over whether the field be criminology or criminal justice can be laid to rest, according to Myren, if it can be seen as an evolutionary process. Criminal justice is an extension of criminology; it is more comprehensive, and, in fact, criminal justice

is "all of the related studies that criminology has left out." [45] The next evolutionary step is to move away from the narrow confines of crime and criminal justice to that of justice. In short, a new field will emerge which will transcend both the old criminology and criminal justice, it will be "transdisciplinary." [46] One anachronistic question remains to be addressed, however, and that has to do with the current tensions between practitioners and academics. These tensions exist between criminology and criminal justice, and within criminal justice itself. Such divisions are appropriate, and, in fact, Myren tries to coin words ("justician" for the practitioner and "justiciologist" for the academic) to point out these distinctions. High on the agenda of professionalization of justiciology is the recognition of such divisions and ensuring that they be healthy and constructive rather than debilitating and destructive. [47] Professional Schools of Justice, presumably like the one at American University, should develop with a blending of the theoretical and applied elements of criminology and criminal justice. The result would be a new discipline and a new profession based upon studies of justice.

Marvin Zalman of Michigan State University, thinks the debates going on between criminology and criminal justice are necessary, and that they should proceed on the academic level because "a critical function of a university department in a professional or quasi-professional field, is to think ahead for the profession's own good." There is, Zalman acknowledges, some overlap between criminology and criminal justice, but, "there is enough real difference between them for criminal justice and criminology, to be considered distinct academic areas," and therefore open to a "heuristic typology."

Criminology, according to Zalman, is concerned with criminal behavior; an interest in criminal justice agencies is tangential to the nature of criminal behavior. Sociology and psychology have dominated criminology, though economics, geography, biology, architecture, political science and history have made significant contributions. In fact, the future of criminology will be tied to this multidisciplinary orientation. Regardless of the various disciplines, criminology is an academic activity. Most criminology practitioners are teachers and researchers of criminology.

Criminal justice, on the other hand, has been more concerned with the agencies of crime control. Studies of criminology are important but not central to criminal justice programs. For example, criminal law courses have been important in criminal justice curriculum. Substantive criminal law, according to Zalman, is criminology, while procedural criminal law is more vital for criminal justice. Most criminal justice persons are line and staff personnel in agencies that deal with criminals. Although increasing in number, those who teach and research in criminal justice comprise a small number of the total criminal justicians. One recent study has shown that most criminal justice programs are still in the two year community college, and that police science courses attract the largest numbers. [48] Since criminal justice is a user of social science rather than a formulator of social science, public administration rather than sociology should figure importantly, suggests Zalman. On the other hand, since the field is so ill defined there will be pressures from students and agencies to make programs more vocational. For that reason, and because the field is so new and thin of content, criminal justice must not cut itself off from other academic disciplines. [49]

Another issue became evident throughout the 1970's. Just what is the place of criminal justice in higher education? Of course, shrinking enrollments have caused some anxieties by the traditional liberal arts departments. At a time when money, personnel and student bodies declined across college campuses, criminal

justice, flush with L.E.A.A. money, hired more professors and increased their instructional units. But also there was some genuine concern by academic professionals who viewed criminal justice as an applied field with little intellectual content. In part, this was due to the historic vocational nature of criminal justice. Aside from Vollmer's innovations at Berkeley most criminal justice was seen as vocational and relegated to in-service training academies. Criminal justice also gained certain reputations due to its connection with the community college movement.

Junior colleges, when they began at the turn of the century, were to copy the first two years of the university. This would continue to be an important function of the two year college to this day. Existing universities, especially those in California which became a center of junior college development, needed and encouraged the junior college movement to siphon off much of the population pressure that was on four year institutions. The late 1920's and 1930's were peak years for junior college growth. There was a sizable number of unemployed young people needing inexpensive education close to home during the Depression. World War II pointed up the need for greater training in technical and semi-professional occupations. Then throughout the 1950's and 1960's the junior colleges, changing their names to community colleges, shifted philosophy. Transfer and terminal education would be offered, but the particular needs and resources of the area serviced by the two year institution would dictate the educational programs.[50] Numerous vocational programs, such as dental hygiene and T.V. electronics and police science, developed. Using retired police officers, practicing attorneys, and probation officials, many community colleges offered very practical oriented criminal justice. Police science or law enforcement programs became popular, and in some places (like Chicago, for example) the police academy itself was linked to the community college system, giving further impetus to vocational criminal justice in higher education.

Such programs were widespread enough, and many traditional academics feared they would become models for university criminal justice. First, who should teach criminal justice on the university level, the person with practical experience or the scholar? In the past the practitioners taught the subject, but future trends indicate the rising importance of the scholar. Some applied fields, such as law, have not thought practicing the craft essential to teaching the art. For example, when President Charles Eliot of Harvard appointed the first full-time law professor in 1873, he selected a man who had never practiced law. Eliot was proud of his choice and remarked that:

> In due course, and that in no long term of years, there will be produced in this country a body of men learned in the law, who have never been on the bench or at the bar, but who nevertheless hold positions of great weight and influence as teachers of the law, as expounders, systematizers and historians. This, I venture to predict, is one of the most far-reaching changes in the organization of the professor that has ever been made in our country.

But the problems of proper legal instruction persisted and in the 1890's David Starr Jordan, President of Stanford University, worried about "pettifogging law schools and an untrained bar." Jordan felt that too many chairs of law were filled by:

> men still in active practice, whose hour in the class-room is taken early in the morning or late in the afternoon, before or after the arduous duties of a day in court. With these men, the court and not the school occupies their thought and fills their ambitions.

Money making rather than research characterized too many teachers of law, and consequently "the atmosphere of culture which surrounds every real institution of learning, and which it is the business of great teachers to create, is unknown to the average student of law."[51]

But, still, criminal justice as opposed to criminology has had many practitioners teaching courses. The practicing attorney, in fact, probably dominates the teaching of criminal law courses in criminal justice programs. Hoffman, Snell, and Webb were aware of these "insiders and outsiders" in criminal justice education and hoped that:

> What may emerge in future criminal justice programs is a mix of applied and scholarly faculties. Perhaps, cleavages may be reduced so that "street experiences" may rub off on the academically oriented and significant theoretical undercurrents may be internalized by the practitioner oriented faculty. The talents of both are needed to make criminal justice education intelligible and useful to future students and the wider public.[52]

Of course, academic economics, which are subject to dramatic shifts, might not allow this ideal mix. In such situations which should be emphasized: the "how to" or the "why" type of criminal justice curriculum? In a way the answer to this question is a philosophical statement of the present position of criminal justice in higher education. In law and medicine the issue was resolved by expanding curriculum, a luxury criminal justice may not have. Brandstatter and Hoover, in 1976, made a study of systemic criminal justice education and suggested there should be a placing of "heavy emphasis upon theoretical considerations in educational curricula while delegating to the practicing agencies the responsibility to teach their newly employed personnel specific procedures unique to the numerous roles in the criminal justice system. In fact, an appropriate standard that might be applied to determining whether a subject ought to be considered educationally appropriate is the universality of its application to criminal justice roles."[53]

Many academicians think such applied programs inappropriate for the university. Many criminal justice academics agree, and, using the legal and medical fields as examples of applied fields with intellectual respectability, they advocated the professional school as the solution. Perhaps a historical example of another applied field that sought academic professionalization might shed light on some of the debates between criminology and criminal justice.

Social work is an instructive example of the professionalization process. In the nineteenth century the care of the poor, the ill, and the distressed was left to individual or organized charity. Anyone wanting to improve humanity was called a social worker.[54] "Friendly visits" to the downtrodden by volunteers or charity agents armed with religious fervor and moral prejudices characterized the period. Social work, by the turn of the century, lacked focus.

The first quarter of the twentieth century was dominated by the search for professional identification. The initial steps in professionalization, which were achieved by 1920, were defining social work's distinctive skills. Mary Richmond's classic work, *Social Diagnosis* (1917), was the first attempt to define casework as the central skill of social work.[55] Caseworkers soon became the spokespeople of the field and the intuitive moralism of the earlier days was replaced with the ideas of "disinterested service" and "technical competence." No longer could the caseworker be judgmental over the worthy poor and the

21

unworthy poor. Who came for help became subordinate to why they came. Caseworkers were professional social investigators using social evidence to mitigate a social problem.[56]

But the monopoly of a special skill does not make a profession. If that were the case, carpenters and plumbers would be professionals rather than craftsmen. It is also important to establish a professional culture, a group identity. Such a culture needs associations to articulate and mold the feelings of the group. The number of professional caseworkers increased but the number of old volunteers did not go down. By 1920 several professional associations arose to reflect group identity and establish standards of practice and criteria for excellence. The American Association of Hospital Social Workers was formed in 1918. Psychiatric social workers would do the same in 1926. But the most important of such organizations was the American Association of Social Workers formed in 1921.[57]

The American Association of Social Workers played a major role in establishing professional standards for social work as a whole. Its concerns were twofold: a) create a positive public image of social work, and b) create a positive self-image of the social worker. The Association wanted to have standards which effectively differentiated between the poorly trained workers and the better trained professionals. The public must be convinced that social work was not the refuge of incompetents and amateurs. Professionalism could be achieved by a code of ethics and higher training standards. Self respect and public respect would result. But, also, to be a profession, social work should have a sound scientific and scholarly base. Certified professional schools of social work were needed for the rise of the profession.[58]

The early social work professionalizers were confronted by the nuclear task (casework) and the demands of agencies. Education plays an important part in professionalism. It gives skills, techniques, and knowledge; it assures, in short, a pool of workers. And social agencies in the cities, wanting to tap the growing number of professional caseworkers, looked to the new school. But many agencies also preferred to train their own people. Agency needs and agency training, in many ways, were inappropriate to professionalization. On-line agencies had unique needs and trained personnel to respond to those needs. Furthermore, being on the front line of activity, agencies had little time to adequately and thoughtfully train people. Most of all, agency training was concerned with practical skills and procedure, and was devoid of broad scientific principles. This practical orientation was more concerned with the here-and-now, and did not expand the boundaries of scientific understanding. So very early there was a tension between the professionalization of a vocation and the professionalization of its academic equivalent. Special professional schools, it was felt, were needed to transform social work from a nuts-and-bolts occupation to a scientifically based profession.[59]

Schools for social work go back to the late nineteenth century. In 1898, for example, the New York Charity Organization Society established a six-week Summer School in Philanthropy. Graham Taylor of the Chicago Commons and Julia Lathrop of Hull House set up the Institute of Social Sciences in 1903. In 1908 it became the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy. Boston, Philadelphia, and St. Louis had similar schools. All the founders agreed that social work demanded a methodology unattainable through the existing apprenticeship training programs.[60]

But often these schools became too closely affiliated with the social agencies of the city. The agencies supplied instructors, provided field work opportunities,

and assured potential placement for the graduates. Consequently, the schools organized their curriculum to satisfy the demands of the agencies; extremely practical and specialized curricula resulted. Casework became the core curriculum. Theory and research was subordinated to technique. This tendency was most marked in New York City and Boston. The Boston School for Social Work, for example, focused almost entirely on field work.[61] The Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, on the other hand, resisted this movement. Edith Abbott and Sophonisba Breckenridge believed that professional social work depended upon a school's ability to produce administrators interested in the broader problems of legislation and community welfare. By 1920 their school became part of the University of Chicago as a graduate professional school of social service administration.[62]

Throughout the 1920's and early 1930's the American Association of Social Workers (and now also the Association of Professional Schools of Social Work) had to deal with one final problem in the professionalization movement. Just what was the place of practical skills such as field work and casework in the academic-professional setting? For too long, field work was associated with technique, procedure, and practical skills. One went into the field to learn the practical aspects of social work. Professional education, on the other hand, emphasized theory and scientific research. These practical skills had to be integrated with academics for the professionalizers to be true to the science of social work and at the same time provide real occupational opportunity to their graduates. It was in the late 1920's and early 1930's that the solution was worked out and social work became an academic profession.[63]

Professional education, it was determined, was not simply learning theory and scientific method. It was also an "experience", a growth process which helps students view and interpret the world in special ways. Education was how a person matured into a professional. Fieldwork, therefore, was not only a training technique, but it was a process and experience as well. Student personality and attitude were to be affected by exposure to field work. Perspectives, not procedures, became the crucial point. In short, professional social work was to be a blend of technical skill, scientific theory, and a professional mindset.[64] By 1930 social work had achieved academic professionalization.

Public administration has had some historical development and crises similar to criminal justice. In spite of such classics as Woodrow Wilson's "The Study of Administration" in 1887, public administration grew out of the Progressive Era's concern over public corruption and inefficiency. The problems and inadequacies of governing America were painfully obvious by the end of the nineteenth century. Previous to the Progressive Era—that period of time roughly encompassing the first decade and a half of the 20th century—government management was heavily politicized, and the solution to mismanagement was simply to "throw the rascals out."[65] Good-government reformers, however, soon proved that something more than honesty was needed to rule cities, states, and the nation. Professional management based upon scientific principles, something akin to the developments in the business world, needed to keep pace with expanding government.

In 1912 the American Political Science Association formed its Committee on Practical Training for Public Service. Two years later this committee, under the leadership of F. Willoughby, issued its *Prepared Plan for Training Schools of Public Service*. The report acknowledged that one function of political science was training people for government service, but such careers were broader than

political science, and special schools of public service needed to be created. The Society for the Promotion of Training for Public Service resulted, and its journal, *The Public Servant*, began campaigning in 1916 for professional schools of public administration. Universities at this time were reluctant to create such schools, and instead a few proprietary schools like the New York Training School for Public Service arose.[66] When some universities did begin to experiment with academic public administration in the 1920's, it was quietly relegated to political science departments as an applied field of study.

The New Deal greatly expanded government. Universities began offering more public administration components within their political science departments, and the first real textbooks on public administration began to appear to draw the boundaries of the field. Added to the political science orientation in curriculum was the "generalist" approach in public administration. Simply put, the generalists believed that the best administrators were not specialists but people of broad (almost British-like civil-servant) backgrounds who could see the overall perspectives and ramifications of decision-making. In fact, in this formative period of public administration, the educator's task was to retool the specialist for the management positions; to make civil engineers, for example, into city managers.[67] Just as the New Deal was winding down, World War II gave rise to another series of administrative crises which sustained the federal government as a marketplace for graduates in public administration. Between 1937 and 1941, alone, fifteen universities established training programs in public administration. In 1939 the American Society for Public Administration was founded and began publishing its journal, *The Public Administration Review*.[68] Public administration, it seems, was riding a crest of academic respectability and marketability.

But it became obvious by the 1940's that as a field of study and as an academic profession public administration needed to reassess itself in higher education. Much like social work, public administration was an applied field, and, although it was part of political science, its future as an academic area was of concern to at least a few. George A. Graham, for example, surveyed sixteen university programs, and in 1941, thought that *Education for Public Administration* suffered from too rapid of a growth. Intellectual content had been sacrificed and

> Research is perhaps the only escape—research that involves the mutual assistance of a broader body of scholars, that is enriched by close collaboration with public officials, and that is related to fundamental problems of government and administration.[69]

In addition, public administration and its mother discipline were undergoing some significant changes. For example, many people who had worked in Washington or in the military returned for university degrees after the war. Their expectations differed from that of pre-war academic public administration students. These new students, having had considerable practical experience, believed that the best students and teachers of public administration were those who had considerable practical experience. Also, since their experiences were at midlevel bureaucracy, they shifted the locus of study from chief executive to bureau levels of administration. Finally, these post-war students believed that the management of government was significantly different from the private sector to remain distinct, and that the logical academic home for public administration must remain in the university political science departments.[70]

Political science and other social sciences, however, were changing in these post-war years. Many political scientists, for example, became caught up in the "behavioralist movement" and began de-emphasizing the study of governmental and political institutions, and began emphasizing individual behavior on the political scene. Dwight Waldo, one of the more prominent students of public administration, felt that it was "unrealistic and unproductive to regard public administration as a subdivision of political science." In fact, he would go on to say, "we are now hardly welcome in the house of our youth."[71] Furthermore, sociology and psychology with their perspectives began to capture academic limelight, and public administration suddenly felt very unscientific amidst the new methodologies. One distraught student wondered if "public administration (was) receiving infusions of insights, theories, typologies, and methods that would strengthen its quality and raise its status? Or was it slowly being nibbled to death?"[72]

The nibbles, it seemed, turned to gobbles in the 1960's. The "generic issue" which had started two decades earlier, would not go down. Administration, to many, was the essential word, and words like "public" and "business" could be sacrificed, and new generic schools of management or administration be created. Management skills, the argument went, transcended the public and private sector. In addition, the marriage between policy studies and public administration seemed to be coming to an end. Numerous policy science programs arose to siphon off students who might have otherwise entered public administration. "Between the pulls of genericism and policy," one observer lamented, "it may be difficult for public administration to retain identity or status."[73]

Throughout the 1960's and 1970's public administration had its identity crisis; the crises, some have said, pretty much went unresolved. Books on *The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration* began to appear, and a few became resigned to the fact that the "discipline will not recover its past glory."[74] Frederick C. Mosher saw that throughout the period there was an "absence of an agreed theoretic base for public administration, of a core and of firm boundaries for the field, even of a definition of what it is."[75] But two additional things, Mosher would suggest, should be kept in mind. First, public administration was undergoing a process of self-examination and self-doubt experienced by other disciplines. Core content, intellectual boundaries, methodologies, and legitimacy were being questioned in many areas. This was due to the realization of the complexity of the world, and the interrelationship of social problems. Academic disciplines were finding that their abilities to handle the real problems of the world were limited.[76] Second, public administration, in addition, had some unique problems. There has always been considerable societal suspicion—if not antagonism—to politics and government. Public administration was associated with that part of government the majority of Americans disliked most: bureaucracy. Furthermore, public administration had continued to emphasize "generalism." But society was increasingly enamored with the specialist, and in many ways lawyers and economists began to replace public administrators in this era of "government by expert."[77]

Dwight Waldo believed the crisis was due to public administration "having enormously expended its periphery without retaining or creating a unifying center."[78] Public administration was not a discipline or even a subdiscipline. Instead, it was a career preparation, and no single discipline could do the job. "No single discipline even comes close; instead, many disciplines and foci now contribute and should contribute." To Waldo the only way the field could

25

survive was to go to a multi-disciplinary approach.[79] Such statements were being made, in the mid-1970's, at the same time the debates between criminology and criminal justice heated.

Conclusions

In many ways criminology and criminal justice have been acting out the process experienced by other academic professions. But they are joined by a common interest, and separated by different perspectives. Criminology, closely linked to an academic tradition through sociology, has felt the need to be the guardian of appropriate academicism in crime-related studies. Criminal justice, more closely associated with the practical application of criminological knowledge, was given a shot of academic adrenalin in the 1970's with the injection of federal monies from L.E.A.A., and wants a secure place in university education.

Both criminology and criminal justice are going through healthy periods of self-assessment and self-criticism. That is, after all, what the debates within and between the disciplines are all about. A recent issue of *Criminology*, the official publication of the American Society of Criminology, was devoted to the theme of "Criminology: New Concerns and New Directions."[80] The theme of the 1979 annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology was "Criminology and Criminal Justice: Convergencies and Divergencies." Numerous articles in the *Journal of Criminal Justice* reflect the same concerns.[81] Members of the Board of Directors of the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards carry on these debates in microcosm.

It is obvious that criminal justice has grown rapidly in the last decade, and the fortunes of criminology have been tied to that growth. Many criminologists are in criminal justice departments. This rapid growth has left little time for maturing. In addition, criminal justice has had to define itself at a time when it was artificially protected and stimulated. In all likelihood this period of rapid growth is over and a leveling off will occur. The time of building makeshift programs and responding to the practical needs of L.E.A.A. is over. The future will not be characterized by accelerated growth. Yet, at a time when warnings are out about "The Ph.D. Meat Market" criminal justice and criminology programs are crowning their academic professionalization by creating doctoral programs.[82]

But the clock ticks on, and crime as a compelling issue may be replaced by concerns over energy and aging policy in the near future. Can criminology and criminal justice survive on their own as the monies of L.E.A.A. diminish or are scattered among more programs and researchers? Right now the debates are academic. But in the future the answers and configurations drawn now may have to relate to survival in a highly competitive and depressed market. In short, crime-related studies may catch up (or is it catch down?) with the plight of other academic professions. Then the debates, pardon the pun, will be less academic.

Notes

1. *Newsweek*, October 27, 1979, p. 27.
2. Richard R. Bennett and Ineke Haen Marshall, "Criminal Justice Education in the United States: A Profile," *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 7 (1979), p. 148.
3. L.L. Bernard and Jessie Bernard, *Origins of American Sociology: The Social Science Movement in the United States*, (New York: Thomas Powell Co., 1943), pp. 844-845.
4. Don C. Gibbons, *The Criminological Enterprise: Theories and Perspectives*, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1979), p. 23.
5. James Carey, *Sociology and Public Affairs: The Chicago School*, (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1975), p. 83.
6. For a discussion of these nineteenth century developments see Ellen Elizabeth Guillot's *Social Factors in Crime as Explained by American Writers of the Civil War and Post Civil War Period*, (Philadelphia, 1943) and Blake McKelvey's *American Prisons: A History of Good Intentions*, (Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1977), pp. 74-75.
7. Quoted in Richard Hofstadter (ed.) *The Progressive Movement, 1900-1915*, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963), p. 73.
8. August Vollmer, "The Policeman as a Social Worker," *International Association of Chiefs of Police: Proceedings*, 1919, pp. 35-38; and Vollmer, "Predelinquency," *Ibid.*, 1921, pp. 77-80.
9. Unfortunately, the only book on Vollmer is the inadequate study by Gene E. Carte and Elaine H. Carte, *Police Reform in the United States: The Era of August Vollmer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975). Fortunately, one of Vollmer's books has been reprinted. August Vollmer, *The Police and Modern Society* (Montclair, N.J.: Patterson Smith Reprint Series, 1971).
10. Samuel Walker, *A Critical History of Police Reform: The Emergence of Professionalism* (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1977), pp. 109-125.
11. Don C. Gibbons, pp. 29, 32, 35-36.
12. Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (New York: Vintage Books, 1963), pp. 24-51. Lawrence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 57-120.
13. Walter C. Reckless, "American Criminology," *Criminology*, 8 (May, 1970), pp. 9-10.
14. James Carey, p. 90.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 36.
16. Patricia Madoo Lengermann, "The Founding of the American Sociological Review: The Anatomy of a Rebellion," *American Sociological Review*, 44 (1979), pp. 191-192.

17. Thorsten Sellin, *Culture, Conflict and Crime* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1938), p. 3.

18. Albert Morris, "The American Society of Criminology: A History, 1941-1974," *Criminology*, 13 (August, 1975), p. 123.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 128

20. *Ibid.*, p. 150.

21. Don C. Gibbons, pp. 78, 112-126.

22. Gene Stephens, "Criminal Justice Education: Past, Present and Future," *Criminal Justice Review*, I (Spring, 1976), p. 109.

23. Burton J. Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America* (New York: W.W. Norton Company, 1976), p. 93.

24. *U.S. News & World Report*, December 3, 1979, p. 42.

25. Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought* (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1963), pp. 51-67.

26. James Carey, p. 75.

27. Burton Bledstein, pp. 4-5, 34.

28. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

29. For the general history of the patent medicines see J.H. Young's *The Toadstool Millionaires* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961). For the medical history see R. Shryock, *The Development of Modern Medicine* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1947), and M. Fishbern's *A History of the American Medical Association, 1847-1947* (Philadelphia: Saunders, 1947).

30. David F. Musto, *The American Disease: Origins of Narcotic Control* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), pp. 14-21, 94.

31. C. Ray Jeffery, "The Challenge to Criminology," *Criminology*, VII (May, 1969), pp. 2-3

32. C. Ray Jeffery, "Criminology, Whither or Wither?," *Criminology*, XV (November, 1977), p. 285.

33. C. Ray Jeffery, "Criminology as an Interdisciplinary Behavioral Science," *Criminology*, XVI (August, 1978), p. 278.

34. Walter C. Reckless, "American Criminology," *Criminology*, VIII (May, 1970), p. 20.

35. See Gene Stephens, "Criminal Justice Education: Past, Present and Future," *Criminal Justice Review*, I (Spring, 1976), p. 113.

36. Gilbert Geis and Robert F. Meier, "Looking Backward and Forward: Criminologists on Criminology as a Career," *Criminology*, XVI (August, 1978), p. 278.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 281.

38. Donald R. Cressey, "Criminological Theory, Social Science, and the Repression of Crime," *Criminology*, XVI (August, 1978), p. 172.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 173. Emphasis in the original quote.

40. *Ibid.*, p. 174.

41. *Ibid.*

42. *Ibid.*, p. 188.

43. See John P. Conrad and Richard A. Myren, *Two Views of Criminology and Criminal Justice: Definitions, Trends and the Future.* (Monograph prepared for the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards, 1979), p. 11.

44. *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 27.

46. *Ibid.*, pp. 34-35.

47. *Ibid.*, p. 29.

48. Richard R. Bennett and Ineke Haen Marshall, "Criminal Justice Education in the United States: A Profile," *Journal of Criminal Justice*, VII (Summer, 1979), pp. 147-172.

49. Marvin Zalman, "Criminology and Criminal Justice: A Heuristic Typology." A paper presented at the 1979 Annual Convention of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Cincinnati, Ohio.

50. Ralph R. Fields, *The Community College Movement* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), pp. 19, 30, 51, 56. Tyrus Hillway, *The American Two-Year College* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), pp. 47, 56, 81. Calvin J. Swink, "Criminal Justice Education: The Dilemma of Articulation," *Journal of Criminal Justice*, III (1975), pp. 217-222.

51. Eliot quoted in Bledstein, p. 282. For Jordan see David Starr Jordan "Pettifogging Law-Schools and an Untrained Bar," *The Forum* IXX (May, 1895) pp. 350-355.

52. Dennis E. Hoffman, Joel C. Snell and Vincent J. Webb, "Insiders and Outsiders in Criminal Justice Education," *Journal of Criminal Justice*, IV (1976), p. 61.

53. Arthur F. Brandstetter and Larry T. Hoover, "Systemic Criminal Justice Education," *Journal of Criminal Justice*, IV (1976), p. 54.

54. Roy Lubove, *The Professional Alturist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career, 1889-1930* (New York: Atkeneum, 1971), p. 119.

55. *Ibid.*, p. 120.

56. *Ibid.*, p. 122.

57. *Ibid.*, pp. 140-141.

58. *Ibid.*, p. 131.

59. *Ibid.*, p. 139.

60. *Ibid.*, pp. 140-141.

61. *Ibid.*, p. 143.

62. *Ibid.*, p. 144.

63. *Ibid.*, p. 151.

64. *Ibid.*, pp. 153-156.

65. Alice B. Stone and Donald C. Stone, "Early Development of Education in Public Administration," in Frederick C. Mosher (ed.) *American Public Administration: Past, Present, Future* (University, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1975), pp. 13-14.

66. Lynton K. Caldwell, "Public Administration and the Universities: A Half-Century of Development," *Public Administration Review*, XXV (1965), pp. 55-56.

67. Rowland Egger, "The Period of Crisis, 1933 to 1945," in Frederick C. Mosher (ed.) *American Public Administration*, p. 65.

68. *Ibid.*, pp. 73-74.

69. George A. Graham, *Education for Public Administration* (Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1941), p. 132.

70. James W. Fesler, "Public Administration and the Social Sciences, 1946-1960," in Frederick C. Mosher (ed.) *American Public Administration*, pp. 105-107.

71. Quoted in Allen Schick's "The Trauma of Politics: Public Administration in the Sixties," in Frederick C. Mosher (ed.) *American Public Administration*, p. 160.

72. James W. Fesler, p. 117.

73. Allen Schick, p. 168.

74. *Ibid.*, p. 175.

75. Frederick C. Mosher, "Introduction" in Frederick C. Mosher (ed.) *American Public Administration*, p. 5.

76. *Ibid.*,

77. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

78. Dwight Waldo, "Education for Public Administration in the Seventies," in Frederick C. Mosher (ed.) *American Public Administration*, p. 185.

79. *Ibid*, p. 223.

80. *Criminology*, XVI (August, 1978).

81. For example see *Journal of Criminal Justice*, VII (Summer, 1979).

82. *Newsweek*, February 4, 1980, p. 74.